

a multi-hierarchical schema for organizing at least one geographical region to facilitate determining relevant travel information,

wherein said multi-hierarchical schema comprises levels of a state, a region within said state, and cities within said region.

5

Claims 62. - 65. (Cancelled)

66. (Previously Presented) The method of Claim 53, further comprising:

determining a category for which a user is requesting information, wherein said  
10 category comprises at least one of:

an interest; and

a destination.

67. (Previously Presented) The method of Claim 27, wherein if said context  
15 comprises a user interest, said step of searching a database searches an interest database for said user interest; and if said context comprises a destination, said step of searching a database searches a destination database for said destination.

68. (Previously Presented) The method of Claim 27, wherein said step of searching  
20 searches both said interest database and said destination database for said phrase request.

**REMARKS**

1. Applicant thanks the Examiner for his findings and conclusions.

2. It should be appreciated that Applicant has elected to amend Claims 1, 27, and 53 solely for the purpose of expediting the patent process in a manner consistent with the PTO's Patent Business Goals, 65 Fed. Reg. 54603 (9/8/00). In making such amendments, Applicant has not and does not in any way narrow the scope of protection to which the Applicant considers the invention herein entitled. Rather, Applicant reserves Applicant's right to pursue such protection at a later point in time and merely seeks to pursue protection for the subject matter presented in this submission.

**Hilton Davis / Festo Statement**

The amendments herein to Claims 1, 27, and 53 were not made for any reason related to patentability. Claims 1, 27, and 53 were amended to clarify the invention. All of the above listed amendments were made for reasons other than patentability.

3. Claims 1-3, 8, 10-12, 14, 18-29, 34, 36-40, 44-52, 61, 67, and 68 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent no. 5,732,398 (hereinafter "Tagawa").

**Independent Claims 1 and 27 and dependent Claims 2, 3, 8, 10-12, 14, 18-26, 28, 29, 34, 36-50, 44-52, 61, 67, and 68**

As to Claim 1, the Applicant respectfully disagrees. Claim 1 requires, "said context determination module processes said phrase request to determine whether context of said phrase corresponds to an interest or a destination". The Applicant cannot see anywhere where Tagawa processes the phrase to determine if the phrase is directed to an interest or if the phrase is directed to a destination. However, as worded the

Applicant can see how Claim 1 is ambiguous. Hence, the Applicant amends Claim 1 to still further clarify the invention. Particularly, the Applicant amends Claim 1 to clarify that the context determination module:

(1) processes said phrase uses a search mechanism; and

5 (2) processes the user entered phrase to determine from the phrase if: the context of the phrase corresponds to an interest or context of the phrase corresponds to a destination.

Support for the amendment is found in the application as filed at least at page 6, lines 4-7. As to point 1, the Tagawa does not teach or suggest a context determination module that uses a search mechanism. As to point 2, Tagawa does not teach or describe a  
10 context determination module that processes a phrase to determine from the phrase the context of the phrase. By the Examiner's own admission, Tagawa does not expressly disclose a context determination module. The context determination module is now defined in Claim 1 as requiring all of: a search mechanism, a user entered phrase,  
15 phrase context, and using the context determination module to process the user entered phrase context to determine if the context of the user entered phrase corresponds to a destination or if the context of the user entered phrase corresponds to an interest. The added required elements of the context determination module are not all obvious in view of Tagawa where the Examiner admits that Tagawa does not expressly disclose a  
20 context determination module. Claim 27 is similarly amended. Accordingly, the current rejection of Claims 1 and 27 and all claims dependent therefrom under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tagawa is deemed to be overcome.

4. Claims 1 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as  
25 being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that the Applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1 and 27

The Examiner notes that the returned search results can be an empty set as claimed. The Applicant amends Claim 1 to further require:

wherein said search result provides interest information if said context determination module determine module determined said phrase corresponds to said interest,

wherein said search result provides destination information if said context determination module determine module determined said phrase corresponds to said destination.

Claim 27 is similarly amended. In view of the above described amendments to Claims 1 and 27, the current rejection of Claims 1 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is deemed to be overcome.

#### Claim 1

The Examiner notes that the clause "said phrase" lacks proper antecedent basis. In view of the above described amendments to parent Claim 1, the current rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is rendered moot.

5. Claims 4, 5, 30, and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tagawa in view of U.S. patent no. 6,457,009 (hereinafter "Bollay").

In view of the above described amendments to parent Claims 1 and 27, the current rejection of dependent Claims 4, 5, 30, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tagawa in view of Bollay is rendered moot.

6. Claims 6, 7, 32, and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tagawa in view of U.S. patent no. 6,601,059 (hereinafter "Fries").

In view of the above described amendments to parent Claims 1 and 27, the current rejection of dependent Claims 6, 7, 32, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tagawa in view of Fries is rendered moot.

- 5 7. Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tagawa in view of U.S. patent no. 5,408,417 (hereinafter "Wilder").

10 In view of the above described amendments to parent Claim 1, the current rejection of dependent Claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tagawa in view of Wilder is rendered moot.

8. Claims 15-17 and 41-43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tagawa in view of www.travelocity.com.

15 In view of the above described amendments to parent Claims 1 and 27, the current rejection of dependent Claims 15-17 and 41-43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tagawa in view of www.travelocity.com is rendered moot.

20 9. Claims 53-56 and 66 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tagawa in view of "The Never-Ending Quest: Search Engine Relevance" by Notes, Greg R.

#### Claim 53

25 The Applicant amends Claim 53 clarify the invention. Particularly, the Applicant amends Claim 53 to clarify that the step of automatically determining processes the context of the search request to determine from the context if: the context of the search request

corresponds to an interest or the context of the search request corresponds to a destination. Support for the amendment is found in the application as filed at least at page 6, lines 4-7. Tagawa does not teach or describe a step of automatically determining where the automatically determining processes a search request to  
5 determine from the phrase the context of the phrase. The step of automatically determining is now defined in Claim 53 as requiring all of: a user entered search request, context of the search request, and automatically determining from the context if the context of the search request corresponds to a destination or if the context of the search request corresponds to an interest. The added required elements of the  
10 automatically determining step are not all obvious in view of Tagawa. Accordingly, the current rejection of Claim 53 and all claims dependent therefrom under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tagawa is deemed to be overcome.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above, the Application is deemed to be in allowable condition. The Examiner is therefore earnestly requested to withdraw all outstanding rejections, allowing the Application to pass to issue as a United States Patent. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the application, the Examiner is respectfully urged to contact Applicant's attorney at (650) 474-8400.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael A. Glenn

Reg. No. 30,176

Customer No. 22862